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Water Wars DA

#### Water scarcity is on the brink --- causes water wars that nuclear and functions as a threat multiplier

Jamail 19 [Dahr Jamail, a Truthout contributing writer, Board of Advisers member and former staff reporter, is the author of The End of Ice: Bearing Witness and Finding Meaning in the Path of Climate Disruption (The New Press, 2019), The Will to Resist: Soldiers Who Refuse to Fight in Iraq and Afghanistan (Haymarket Books, 2009), and Beyond the Green Zone: Dispatches From an Unembedded Journalist in Occupied Iraq (Haymarket Books, 2007). “The World Is on the Brink of Widespread Water Wars.” February 11, 2019. Truthout. https://truthout.org/articles/the-world-is-on-the-brink-of-widespread-water-wars/]

Mark’s words should be a call to attention, and a call to action. The plight of farmers in Australia illustrates a larger reality: As planetary temperatures continue to increase and rainfall patterns shift due to human-caused climate disruption, our ability to grow crops and have enough drinking water will become increasingly challenged, and the outlook is only going to worsen. The most recent United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report warned of increasingly intense droughts and mass water shortages around large swaths of the globe. But even more conservative organizations have been sounding the alarm. “Water insecurity could multiply the risk of conflict,” warns one of the World Bank’s reports on the issue. “Food price spikes caused by droughts can inflame latent conflicts and drive migration. Where economic growth is impacted by rainfall, episodes of droughts and floods have generated waves of migration and spikes in violence within countries.” In some places conflict is practically guaranteed. Meanwhile, a study published in the journal Global Environmental Change, looked at how “hydro-political issues” — including tensions and potential conflicts — could play out in countries expected to experience water shortages coupled with high populations and pre-existing geopolitical tensions. The study warned that these factors could combine to increase the likelihood of water-related tensions — potentially escalating into armed conflict in cross-boundary river basins in places around the world by 74.9 to 95 percent. This means that in some places conflict is practically guaranteed. These areas include regions situated around primary rivers in Asia and North Africa. Noted rivers include the Tigris and Euphrates, the Indus, the Nile, and the Ganges-Brahmaputra. Consider the fact that 11 countries share the Nile River basin: Egypt, Burundi, Kenya, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Uganda, Rwanda, Sudan, South Sudan, Tanzania and the Democratic Republic of Congo. All told, more than 300 million people already live in these countries, — a number that is projected to double in the coming decades, while the amount of available water will continue to shrink due to climate change. For those in the US thinking these potential conflicts will only occur in distant lands — think again. The study also warned of a very high chance of these “hydro-political interactions” in portions of the southwestern US and northern Mexico, around the Colorado River. India and Pakistan Potential tensions are particularly worrisome in India and Pakistan, which are already rivals when it comes to water resources. For now, these two countries have an agreement, albeit a strained one, over the Indus River and the sharing of its water, by way of the 1960 Indus Water Treaty. However, water claims have been central to their ongoing, burning dispute over the Kashmir region, a flashpoint area there for more than 60 years and counting. The aforementioned treaty is now more strained than ever, as Pakistan accuses India of limiting its water supply and violating the treaty by placing dams over various rivers that flow from Kashmir into Pakistan. In fact, a 2018 report from the International Monetary Fund ranked Pakistan third among countries facing severe water shortages, This is largely due to the rapid melting of glaciers in the Himalaya that are the source of much of the water for the Indus. To provide an idea of how quickly water resources are diminishing in both countries, statistics from Pakistan’s Islamabad Chamber of Commerce and Industry from 2018 show that water availability (per capita in cubic meters per year) shrank from 5,260 in 1951, to 940 in 2015, and are projected to shrink to 860 by just 2025. In India, the crisis is hardly better. According to that country’s Ministry of Statistics (2016) and the Indian Ministry of Water Resources (2010), the per capita available water in cubic meters per year was 5,177 in 1951, and 1,474 in 2015, and is projected to shrink to 1,341 in 2025. Both of these countries are nuclear powers. Given the dire projections of water availability as climate change progresses, nightmare scenarios of water wars that could spark nuclear exchanges are now becoming possible. As if to underscore all of this, even the US military recently warned that climate change is a worldwide threat. The military’s Worldwide Threat Assessment report warned that climate change and other types of environmental degradation threatened global stability because they are “likely to fuel competition for resources, economic distress, and social discontent through 2019 and beyond.”

#### Asteroid mining singlehandedly solves scarcity

Kean 15 [Sam Kean is an American writer. He has written for The New York Times Magazine, Mental Floss, Slate, Psychology Today, and The New Scientist, and has published 6 books on scientific discoveries. “The End of Thirst.” December 2015. *The Atlantic.* https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2015/12/the-end-of-thirst/413176/]

If Earth does run dry, we might be able to save ourselves by mining water from asteroids and comets. Scientists have landed probes on these space rocks to study them. Future landers could mine them in deep space or possibly even drag them back toward Earth. Though the idea sounds far-fetched, space-mining companies already exist, and one of them, Planetary Resources, expects to start harvesting resources from asteroids in about a decade. According to Planetary Resources, a single 1,600-foot-wide asteroid could yield more platinum than has ever been mined in human history. But water could prove to be the real prize for space-mining companies. Some astronomers believe that the asteroid Ceres, which sits between Jupiter and Mars, may contain more freshwater (as ice) than all of Earth does. In addition to quenching people’s thirst, this water could be turned into fuel for interplanetary spaceships. In that case, an ample supply of water would be the key to a happy future not just down here on the ground, but up among the stars as well.
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#### Commercial space manufacturing is booming and solves disease, but the plan kills it --- private launch and appropriation is key

Giulianotti et. al 21 [Marc A. Giulianotti1\*, Arun Sharma2,3, Rachel A. Clemens4 , Orquidea Garcia5 , D. Lancing Taylor6, Nicole L. Wagner7 , Kelly A. Shepard8 , Anjali Gupta4, Siobhan Malany9 , Alan J. Grodzinsky10, Mary Kearns‐Jonker11, Devin B. Mair12, Deok‐Ho Kim12,13, Michael S. Roberts1, Jeanne F. Loring14, Jianying Hu15, Lara E. Warren1 , Sven Eenmaa1, Joe Bozada16, Eric Paljug16, Mark Roth17, Donald P. Taylor18, Gary Rodrigue1, Patrick Cantini19, Amelia W. Smith1, William R. Wagner19,20\* 1 Center for the Advancement of Science in Space, Melbourne, FL, USA 2 Board of Governors Regenerative Medicine Institute, Cedars‐Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA, USA 3 Smidt Heart Institute, Cedars‐Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA, USA 4 Axiom Space, Inc., Houston, TX, USA 5 Johnson & Johnson 3D Printing Innovation & Customer Solutions, Johnson & Johnson Services, Inc., Irvine, CA , USA. 6 University of Pittsburgh Drug Discovery Institute and Department of Computational and Systems Biology, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA 7 LambdaVision Inc., Farmington, CT, USA 8 California Institute for Regenerative Medicine, Oakland, California, USA 9 Department of Pharmacodynamics, College of Pharmacy, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL USA 10 Departments of Biological Engineering, Mechanical Engineering and Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA 11 Department of Pathology and Human Anatomy, Loma Linda University School of Medicine, Loma Linda, CA, USA 12 Department of Biomedical Engineering, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA 13 Department of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA 14 Scripps Research Institute, San Diego, CA, USA 15 Center for Computational Health IBM Research, Yorktown Heights, NY, USA 16 Joseph M. Katz Graduate School of Business, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA 17 Pittsburgh, PA, USA 18 The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA 19 McGowan Institute for Regenerative Medicine, Pittsburgh, PA, USA 20 Departments of Surgery, Bioengineering, Chemical Engineering, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA. “Opportunities for Biomanufacturing in Low Earth Orbit: Current Status and Future Directions.” August 2, 2021. https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202108.0044/v1/download]

The use of LEO by governments and commercial enterprises is a complex ecosystem for providing opportunities and financing. In the last two decades, governments around the world, led by the U.S. and China, have heavily supported private space companies (2019 Report). These investments have focused on launch technologies, as high launch costs are perceived to be the greatest limiting factor to expanded space exploration and utilization (Werzt et al., 1996) and have led to recent reductions in the cost of transporting cargo to LEO by a factor of more than 20. Between 1970 and 2020, the average cost to launch a kilogram of payload into LEO on the space shuttle remained constant at about $54,500. Now, the cost per kilogram is $2,720 on a SpaceX Falcon 9 rocket (Figure 1) (Jones, H. W. et al., 2020). Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 2 August 2021 doi:10.20944/preprints202108.0044.v1 4 Figure 1: The cost of launching payloads to LEO has dropped considerably over the last 50 years. Note: Data is not to scale. Additionally, several private companies are now pursuing commercial space stations. Axiom Space, headquartered in Houston, is currently developing what promises to be the first‐ever privately operated space station, with the initial module scheduled to launch to the ISS in 2024. Axiom plans to dock multiple modules to the ISS that will eventually detach to become a standalone station. As the cost of transport to LEO has decreased—and is expected to decrease further—and plans for new platforms in LEO continue to advance (Dinkin S., 2019), opportunities in areas such as satellite deployment, biomedical research, in‐space manufacturing, and space tourism increase. Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 2 August 2021 doi:10.20944/preprints202108.0044.v1 5 As the past half century has witnessed the opening of space for exploration and commercial opportunities, in this same period, we have experienced exponential growth in our understanding of biology and physiology. This knowledge has been translated and commercialized for the benefit of human health and continues to accelerate as new technologies create additional tools to explore and cure. One aspect of this biomedical revolution is in the field of regenerative medicine, built upon advances in stem cell biology, biomaterials, and bioengineering. Remarkable advancements have been made in the design of MPS, also called tissue chips or organs‐on‐chips, and organoids that can mimic complex organ systems outside of the body for drug development or potential implantation to restore function. Stem cell isolation, characterization, and manipulation is advancing, with target applications broadly spread across tissues impacted by disease, trauma, and congenital conditions. Biomaterials and bioengineering advances have created new medical devices, targeted drug delivery platforms, biosensors and new imaging modalities, and the bioprinting of tissue constructs. To take advantage of these significant advances—more frequent and more affordable access to LEO and exponential progress in biomedical technology—the question is: How do these intersect, and what new opportunities arise as both advance? How can the unique LEO environment be leveraged to further advance biomanufacturing? Compelling answers to these questions will introduce economic drivers for investment in space‐based R&D that extend beyond the initial focus on pure discovery and into the expansion of commercial development in LEO. Over the past decade, the ISS National Lab has supported important space‐based research in the areas of tissue engineering and regenerative medicine that lays the groundwork for more complex studies and future investment. This critical research addressed fundamental questions such as: How does the LEO environment affect the organ function mimicked by tissue chips, and how do these changes relate to human disease? How does microgravity affect stem cell proliferation and differentiation? And how might 3D bioprinting benefit from the absence of gravity? Continued access to LEO through the ISS National Lab provides a unique opportunity for R&D that enables the jump from this initial work to the development of a sustainable market for biomanufacturing in space. The ISS is a powerful platform with a limited lifetime and thus limited time left for utilization; therefore, now is the time to leverage this invaluable orbiting laboratory to conduct R&D that demonstrates the value of biomanufacturing in space. This work will set the stage for increased private investment and the transition to larger and more numerous platforms in LEO that can support further discovery and development in the coming decades

#### Extinction

Yaneer Bar-Yam 16, Founding President of the New England Complex Systems Institute, “Transition to extinction: Pandemics in a connected world,” NECSI (July 3, 2016), http://necsi.edu/research/social/pandemics/transition

Watch as one of the more aggressive—brighter red — strains rapidly expands. After a time it goes extinct leaving a black region. Why does it go extinct? The answer is that it spreads so rapidly that it kills the hosts around it. Without new hosts to infect it then dies out itself. That the rapidly spreading pathogens die out has important implications for evolutionary research which we have talked about elsewhere [1–7].¶ In the research I want to discuss here, what we were interested in is the effect of adding long range transportation [8]. This includes natural means of dispersal as well as unintentional dispersal by humans, like adding airplane routes, which is being done by real world airlines (Figure 2).¶ When we introduce long range transportation into the model, the success of more aggressive strains changes. They can use the long range transportation to find new hosts and escape local extinction. Figure 3 shows that the more transportation routes introduced into the model, the more higher aggressive pathogens are able to survive and spread.¶ As we add more long range transportation, there is a critical point at which pathogens become so aggressive that the entire host population dies. The pathogens die at the same time, but that is not exactly a consolation to the hosts. We call this the phase transition to extinction (Figure 4). With increasing levels of global transportation, human civilization may be approaching such a critical threshold.¶ In the paper we wrote in 2006 about the dangers of global transportation for pathogen evolution and pandemics [8], we mentioned the risk from Ebola. Ebola is a horrendous disease that was present only in isolated villages in Africa. It was far away from the rest of the world only because of that isolation. Since Africa was developing, it was only a matter of time before it reached population centers and airports. While the model is about evolution, it is really about which pathogens will be found in a system that is highly connected, and Ebola can spread in a highly connected world.¶ The traditional approach to public health uses historical evidence analyzed statistically to assess the potential impacts of a disease. As a result, many were surprised by the spread of Ebola through West Africa in 2014. As the connectivity of the world increases, past experience is not a good guide to future events.¶ A key point about the phase transition to extinction is its suddenness. Even a system that seems stable, can be destabilized by a few more long-range connections, and connectivity is continuing to increase.¶ So how close are we to the tipping point? We don’t know but it would be good to find out before it happens.¶ While Ebola ravaged three countries in West Africa, it only resulted in a handful of cases outside that region. One possible reason is that many of the airlines that fly to west Africa stopped or reduced flights during the epidemic [9]. In the absence of a clear connection, public health authorities who downplayed the dangers of the epidemic spreading to the West might seem to be vindicated.¶ As with the choice of airlines to stop flying to west Africa, our analysis didn’t take into consideration how people respond to epidemics. It does tell us what the outcome will be unless we respond fast enough and well enough to stop the spread of future diseases, which may not be the same as the ones we saw in the past. As the world becomes more connected, the dangers increase.¶ Are people in western countries safe because of higher quality health systems? Countries like the U.S. have highly skewed networks of social interactions with some very highly connected individuals that can be “superspreaders.” The chances of such an individual becoming infected may be low but events like a mass outbreak pose a much greater risk if they do happen. If a sick food service worker in an airport infects 100 passengers, or a contagion event happens in mass transportation, an outbreak could very well prove unstoppable.
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Unilat CP

#### The United States federal government should:

#### --Substantially increase active debris removal

#### --Should declare debris in space to be abandoned property, with the right to salvage, and make our expired satellites available for salvage

#### -- Contributing to debris removal projects and establishing a space situational awareness catalogue that requires satellite declassification and notice in the case of impending collision with the governments of formal allies of the United States

#### --ensure standardization and integration of all shared space situational awareness data.

#### US commercial space leadership is necessary and sufficient to solve global Chinese dominance

--CP promulgates a set of standards initiated by the US – makes us first mover and shores up commercial space leadership

--China will dominate space and use it to create a new era of heg – need to have leadership and strong commercial sector

--will get to space and control info flows – selling satellites for cheap to poorest and broadcasting lies about US + shielding events in Tibet – undermines US cred and soft power

--will also get huge money from space and do sbsp – means they’ll have free energy to hold over the rest of the world

--Commercial sector key – need creative disruption, not bureaucracy and groupthink of the DOD to get to space quicker and more innovatively

Autry and Kwast 19 – Director of the Southern California Commercial Spaceflight Initiative-USC, PhD & former Prof of Entrepreneurship & Strategy-UC Irvine; Lt. Gen & Cmdr-USAF, Prof-Air University

Greg Autry, PhD & MBA-UC Irvine, Director of the Southern California Commercial Spaceflight Initiative-USC, served on the NASA Agency Review Team and as White House Liaison at NASA, former Professor of Entrepreneurship, Strategy, & Econ-UC Irvine, on the editorial board of the New Space Journal, co-author of Death by China, Beijing’s Fight for the Final Frontier, and Steven L. Kwast, Lt Gen-USAF, Commander & President of Air University-Maxwell AFB, MA in Public Policy-Harvard's Kennedy School of Government, former National Defense Fellow-Institute for the Study of Conflict, Ideology and Policy at Boston University, America Is Losing the Second Space Race to China, 22 August 2019, https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/08/22/america-is-losing-the-second-space-race-to-china/

America Is Losing the Second Space Race to China The private sector can give the United States a much-needed rocket boost. The current U.S. space defense strategy is inadequate and on a path to failure. President Donald Trump’s vision for a Space Force is big enough. As he said on June 18, “It is not enough to merely have an American presence in space. We must have American dominance in space.” But the Air Force is not matching this vision. Instead, the leadership is currently focused on incremental improvements to existing equipment and organizational structures. Dominating the vast and dynamic environment of space will require revolutionary capabilities and resources far deeper than traditional Department of Defense thinking can fund, manage, or even conceive of. Success depends on a much more active partnership with the commercial space industry— and its disruptive capabilities.

U.S. military space planners are preparing to repeat a conflict they imagined back in the 1980s, which never actually occurred, against a vanished Soviet empire. Meanwhile, China is executing a winning strategy in the world of today. It is burning hard toward domination of the future space markets that will define the next century. They are planning infrastructure in space that will control 21st-century telecommunications, energy, transportation, and manufacturing. In doing so, they will acquire trillion-dollar revenues as well as the deep capabilities that come from continuous operational experience in space. This will deliver space dominance and global hegemony to China’s authoritarian rulers.

Despite the fact that many in the policy and intelligence communities understand exactly what China is doing and have been trying to alert leadership, Air Force leadership has convinced the White House to fund only a slightly better satellite command with the same leadership, while sticking a new label onto their outmoded thinking. A U.S. Space Force or Corps with a satellite command will never fulfill Trump’s call to dominate space. Air Force leadership is demonstrating the same hubris that Gen. George Custer used in convincing Congress, over President Ulysses S. Grant’s better experience intuition, that he could overtake the Black Hills with repeating rifles and artillery. That strategy of technological overconfidence inflamed conflict rather than subduing it, and the 7th Cavalry were wiped out at the Battle of the Little Bighorn.

The West was actually won by the settlers, ranchers, miners, and railroad barons who were able to convert the wealth of the territory itself into the means of holding it. They laid the groundwork that made the 20th century the American Century and delivered freedom to millions of people in Europe and Asia. Of course, they also trampled the indigenous people of the American West in their wake—but empty space comes with no such bloody cost. The very emptiness and wealth of this new, if not quite final, frontier, however, means that competition for resources and strategic locations in cislunar space (between the Earth and moon) will be intense over the next two decades. The outcome of this competition will determine the fate of humanity in the next century.

China’s impending dominance will neutralize U.S. geopolitical power by allowing Beijing to control global information flows from the high ground of space. Imagine a school in Bolivia or a farmer in Kenya choosing between paying for a U.S. satellite internet or image provider or receiving those services for free as a “gift of the Chinese people.” It will be of little concern to global consumers that the news they receive is slanted or that searches for “free speech” link to articles about corruption in Western democracies. Nor will they care if concentration camps in Tibet and the Uighur areas of western China are obscured, or if U.S. military action is presented as tyranny and Chinese expansion is described as peacekeeping or liberation.

China’s aggressive investment in space solar power will allow it to provide cheap, clean power to the world, displacing U.S. energy firms while placing a second yoke around the developing world. Significantly, such orbital power stations have dual use potential and, if properly designed, could serve as powerful offensive weapons platforms.

China’s first step in this process is to conquer the growing small space launch market. Beijing is providing nominally commercial firms with government-manufactured, mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles they can use to dump launch services on the market below cost. These start-ups are already undercutting U.S. pricing by 80 percent. Based on its previous success in using dumping to take out U.S. developed industries such as solar power modules and drones, China will quickly move upstream to attack the leading U.S. launch providers and secure a global commercial monopoly. Owning the launch market will give them an unsurmountable advantage against U.S. competitors in satellite internet, imaging, and power.

The United States can still build a strategy to win. At this moment, it holds the competitive advantage in every critical space technology and has the finest set of commercial space firms in the world. It has pockets of innovative military thinkers within groups like the Defense Innovation Unit, under Mike Griffin, the Pentagon’s top research and development official. If the United States simply protects the intellectual property its creative minds unleash and defend its truly free markets from strategic mercantilist attack, it will not lose this new space race. The United States has done this before. It beat Germany to the nuclear bomb, it beat the Soviet Union to the nuclear triad, and it won the first space race.

None of those victories was achieved by embracing the existing bureaucracy. Each of them depended on the president of the day following the only proven path to victory in a technological domain: establish a small team with a positively disruptive mindset and empower that team to investigate a wide range of new concepts, work with emerging technologies, and test innovative strategies. Today that means giving a dedicated Space Force the freedom to easily partner with commercial firms and leverage the private capital in building sustainable infrastructure that actually reduces the likelihood of conflict while securing a better economic future for the nation and the world.

#### Hegemony solves extinction

Keck 14

Zachary Keck is Managing Editor of The Diplomat, The Diplomat, January 24, 2014, “America’s Relative Decline: Should We Panic?”, http://thediplomat.com/2014/01/americas-relative-decline-should-we-panic/

Regardless of your opinion on U.S. global leadership over the last two decades, however, there is good reason to fear its Regardless of your opinion on U.S. global leadership over the last two decades, however, there is good reason to fear its relative decline compared with China and other emerging nations. To begin with, hegemonic transition periods have historically been the most destabilizing eras in history. This is not only because of the malign intentions of the rising and established power(s). Even if all the parties have benign, peaceful intentions, the rise of new global powers necessitates revisions to the “rules of the road.” This is nearly impossible to do in any organized fashion given the anarchic nature of the international system, where there is no central authority that can govern interactions between states.

We are already starting to see the potential dangers of hegemonic transition periods in the Asia-Pacific (and arguably the Middle East). As China grows more economically and militarily powerful, it has unsurprisingly sought to expand its influence in East Asia. This necessarily has to come at the expense of other powers, which so far has primarily meant the U.S., Japan, Vietnam and the Philippines. Naturally, these powers have sought to resist Chinese encroachments on their territory and influence, and the situation grows more tense with each passing day. Should China eventually emerge as a global power, or should nations in other regions enjoy a similar rise as Kenny suggests, this situation will play itself out elsewhere in the years and decades ahead.

All of this highlights some of the advantages of a unipolar system. Namely, although the U.S. has asserted military force quite frequently in the post-Cold War era, it has only fought weak powers and thus its wars have been fairly limited in terms of the number of casualties involved. At the same time, America’s preponderance of power has prevented a great power war, and even restrained major regional powers from coming to blows. For instance, the past 25 years haven’t seen any conflicts on par with the Israeli-Arab or Iran-Iraq wars of the Cold War. As the unipolar era comes to a close, the possibility of great power conflict and especially major regional wars rises dramatically. The world will also have to contend with conventionally inferior powers like Japan acquiring nuclear weapons to protect their interests against their newly empowered rivals.

But even if the transitions caused by China’s and potentially other nations’ rises are managed successfully, there are still likely to be significant negative effects on international relations. In today’s “globalized” world, it is commonly asserted that many of the defining challenges of our era can only be solved through multilateral cooperation. Examples of this include climate change, health pandemics, organized crime and terrorism, global financial crises, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, among many others.

A unipolar system, for all its limitations, is uniquely suited for organizing effective global action on these transnational issues. This is because there is a clear global leader who can take the initiative and, to some degree, compel others to fall in line. In addition, the unipole’s preponderance of power lessens the intensity of competition among the global players involved. Thus, while there are no shortages of complaints about the limitations of global governance today, there is no question that global governance has been many times more effective in the last 25 years than it was during the Cold War

#### Data-sharing with allies solves the aff

Loverro 14 – Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Space Policy, Department of Defense

Douglas L., 3/12. “STATEMENT OF MR. DOUGLAS L. LOVERRO DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR SPACE POLICY BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES.” https://www.armed-services.senate.gov/download/loverro\_03-12-14

Our efforts here go beyond mere words – they are backed by actions. As I have discussed before, a key aspect of improving spaceflight safety, and assuring we can monitor the space environment more closely, is our space situational awareness (SSA) capabilities. We have been working on this for some time, and I am happy to report that we have made some real progress over the last year. That progress comes in two forms – new sensors and information sharing agreements.

On the sensor front, we have remained on a constant path for the last several years to reposition sensors where they can do the most good and to invest in new sensors where needed. Last year we reported that we had entered into an agreement with Australia to relocate and repurpose a launch tracking radar, the C-Band radar, from Antigua to western Australia to aid in our ability to monitor activities at low altitude in the southern hemisphere. That work is now underway. We complemented that effort with a second agreement signed with Australia this past November to relocate the DARPA-developed Space Surveillance Telescope to western Australia to give us an unmatched ability to track deep space objects in that critical region of the world. Additionally, after years of focused effort, and a sequestration-imposed six-month delay, we will soon award the contract for the first Space Fence site. The Space Fence will provide an unprecedented ability to track an order-of-magnitude greater number of objects in low earth orbit, supporting long-term spaceflight safety.

The Department has also made great strides in more transparently sharing SSA information with other space operators. Over the past year, U.S. Strategic Command (USSTRATCOM) has continued to pursue SSA sharing agreements with commercial companies and foreign governments, consistent with existing legislative authority. This year, USSTRATCOM signed five agreements with other governments – Australia, Japan, Italy, Canada, and France – and increased to forty-one our agreements with commercial satellite operators. Many more agreements are in varying stages of negotiation. We are committed to providing SSA services to enhance spaceflight safety for all.

While the purpose of these agreements is to allow us to share more advanced space flight safety products with other space-faring nations, they really serve to lay the groundwork for the next stage of effort – two-way data sharing. The space environment is too big and too complex for a single nation to bear the entire cost of monitoring it. Cost-effective SSA requires cooperation among space actors. The increasingly congested space environment means that an unparalleled level of information sharing is needed to promote safe and responsible operations in space and to reduce the likelihood of mishaps, misperceptions, and mistrust. We are currently engaged in detailed technical discussions with several nations that have space situational awareness capabilities to explore opportunities for two-way information exchange. This type of sharing will increase SSA information available to the United States while limiting unnecessary duplication of SSA capabilities. In short, we save money and improve safety for us and our allies.
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#### 1AC Scoles is about redirecting asteroids --- Haven reads green.

Scoles 15, [(Sarah Scoles, freelance science writer, contributor at Wired and Popular Science, author of the books Making Contact and They Are Already Here) “Dust from asteroid mining spells danger for satellites,” New Scientist, May 27, 2015, https://www.newscientist.com/article/mg22630235-100-dust-from-asteroid-mining-spells-danger-for-satellites/] Recut DurSac

--- They cite – Javier Roa, Space Dynamic Group, Applied Physics Department, Technical University of Madrid. Casey J Handmer, Theoretical Astrophysics, California Institute of Technology. Both PhD Candidates. “Quantifying hazards: asteroid disruption in lunar distant retrograde orbits,” arXiv, Cornell University, May 14, 2015, https://arxiv.org/pdf/1505.03800.pdf

NASA chose the second option for its Asteroid Redirect Mission, which aims to pluck a boulder from an asteroid’s surface and relocate it to a stable orbit around the moon. But an asteroid’s gravity is so weak that it’s not hard for surface particles to escape into space. Now a new model warns that debris shed by such transplanted rocks could intrude where many defence and communication satellites live – in geosynchronous orbit.

According to Casey Handmer of the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena and Javier Roa of the Technical University of Madrid in Spain, 5 per cent of the escaped debris will end up in regions traversed by satellites. Over 10 years, it would cross geosynchronous orbit 63 times on average. A satellite in the wrong spot at the wrong time will suffer a damaging high-speed collision with that dust.

The study also looks at the “catastrophic disruption” of an asteroid 5 metres across or bigger. Its total break-up into a pile of rubble would increase the risk to satellites by more than 30 per cent (arxiv.org/abs/1505.03800).

#### Asteroid redirection enables astroterror --- blanket bans fail, but non-redirect enables the industry to move forward.

Drmola and Mareš 15 - Jakub Drmola is a PhD student and Miroslav Mareš professor, at the Divison of Security and Strategic Studies, Masaryk University, Czech Republic, "Revisiting the deflection dilemma", *Astronomy & Geophysics*, Volume 56, Issue 5, October 2015, Pages 5.15–5.18, https://academic.oup.com/astrogeo/article/56/5/5.15/235650

There are two basic ways to go about moving the resources contained within a given asteroid to the Earth. They can be extracted from the asteroid during its natural orbit and then transported to the Earth, or the entire asteroid might be moved closer to a more convenient location before starting mining. Thus repositioned, it might even be used as a shielded habitat, once hollowed out (Ostro 1999). There are different speculative costs and benefits associated with either option, which would vary with the size, orbit and composition of the asteroid. But, crucially, the second option would entail putting asteroids into orbit around the Earth, the Moon or possibly at one of the Earth’s Lagrangian points. Indeed, NASA has already planned a mission to capture a small asteroid and place it in a high cislunar orbit, where it would serve as a destination for future manned missions and experiments. This “Asteroid Redirect Mission” is to take place in the next decade and is being pitched mainly as a stepping stone towards a future mission to Mars (see box “NASA’s Asteroid Redirect Mission”; Brophy et al. 2012, Burchell 2014, Gates et al. 2015). Programmes to redirect asteroids and, especially, plans to mine asteroids on an industrial scale essentially resurrect the deflection dilemma. But it is no longer a matter of superpowers intentionally misusing technology designed to prevent dangerous impacts. It becomes an issue of proliferation among private entities. Once private mining companies acquire the technical ability to redirect suitable NEOs (Baoyin et al. 2011) in order to extract platinum or water from them, perilous inflections become more likely. The probability of accidents will rise with the number of asteroids whose trajectories we decide to manipulate. Such accidents might be very unlikely, but even a tiny technical or human error in the execution of an inflection meant to place an asteroid into the lunar or geocentric orbit might send it crashing into the Earth with potentially devastating consequences. And while we might find solace in the low probabilities associated with such an accident, even contemporary industries which are considered very safe suffer from unlikely tragedies. Despite being dependable and reliable, airliners do crash; there are a lot of them flying and very improbable accidents do happen if the dice are rolled often enough. Undoubtedly, we will not be steering as many asteroids as we steer planes any time soon, but industries tend to be more accident-prone during their infancy. Furthermore, a single asteroid can do a lot more damage than a single plane. And who is to say how much metal or water we are going to need in space over the course of the 21st century, or the next? The second source of risk is the intentional misuse, similar to the original deflection dilemma. But the entry barrier for asteroid weaponization gets much lower if mining them and moving them around becomes a common industrial activity. This is in stark contrast to the original scenario which envisioned this technology to be used solely for planetary defence and under control of a very small number of the most powerful countries (Morrison 2010). If such a powerful technology becomes widely and commercially available, even rogue states and wellfunded terrorist groups might be tempted to use it for an unexpected and devastating attack. In addition, an active asteroid mining industry would make it more difficult to detect any hostile inflection attempts among the number of legitimate and benign ones. Policy implications Considering these possible future dangers, it seems prudent to consider what to do about them sooner rather than later. The most obvious “solution” would be a blanket ban on the development of any technology that might lead to artificially inflected asteroids crashing into the Earth. However, such a ban would be incompatible with the dream of increased presence of humans in the solar system. It would stymie both scientific exploration and economic development here on Earth, which is increasingly dependent on precious metals and spacebased technologies. Furthermore, this approach would leave us more vulnerable to natural impacts which, in the long view, seems less than desirable. Another approach might be similar to the current regime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, aiming to support peaceful civilian use of nuclear power while at the same time prohibiting the spread of weapons of mass destruction. The regime mostly works (with caveats, see Wood et al. 2008) because these applications require different infrastructures and fissile materials enriched to different levels of purity. This makes it possible, at least in principle, to tell apart operations meant for the production of electricity and those designed to create weapons. Unfortunately, the difference between legitimate and hostile trajectory modification would lie only in the acceleration imparted on the asteroid and not in the technical means to do it. As the spacecraft launched with the intent to cause impact with the Earth might be identical to those sent off to retrieve resources, telling them apart would be nearly impossible, until it was too late. And this approach makes no difference to the chances of an industrial accident. If monitoring equipment on Earth is unhelpful, the focus changes to space. In other words, all asteroid movement missions should be constantly monitored. For an attacker, it would make most sense to delay the final course adjustment for as long as possible in order to give the least warning and make the timeframe for reaction as short as possible. So an asteroid might head towards a safe orbit fit for resource extraction for most of its altered flight time, but be further accelerated at the last possible moment onto an impact trajectory, perhaps mere days before it hits a major city. Our current programmes cataloguing NEOs (such as CSS or Pan-STARRS), which look for new, previously unknown objects, are not ideally suited for the task of constantly tracking a number of different, already known asteroids. New instruments would be needed to track them in order to immediately detect any hazardous inflection, whether intentional or accidental. Once such a detection is made, emergency measures to evacuate the population or, preferably, to “re-deflect” the incoming object can be executed right away, regardless of the cause. Accidents and hostilities could be treated the same way and countered by the same system (initially, at least). Such a system would be more akin to an air traffic control than a non-proliferation regulation, offering security through vigilance, rather than absence. Additionally, development of a system able to deflect incoming objects at relatively short notice would be beneficial in case of an impending natural impact. Conclusion Perhaps none of these concerns will become relevant. Maybe the idea of asteroid mining will soon fizzle out because we will discover cheaper and more efficient local alternatives. Maybe humanity will lose the will or the capability to explore space any further. Or perhaps manipulating asteroid trajectories will prove impractical or too costly. Certainly, it would not be the first time that a promising and seemingly obvious future does not come about. In the 1960s it seemed almost self-evident that by the second decade of the 21st century we would have flying cars and a base on the Moon. Yet we do not. Asteroid mining might be a similar case of unfulfilled promises and misplaced visions. On the other hand, there are examples of industries that developed surprisingly fast despite being considered unrealistic, not too long ago: air travel, nuclear power generation, or commercial satellites. The spread of the internet and the accompanying digital information revolution is another example; hardly anyone anticipated having virtually the entire repository of human knowledge at our fingertips at all times (except Douglas Adams). Whether the deflection dilemma forever remains an unmaterialized threat or it becomes a palpable problem, it is something to be mindful of now, as the foundations of the prospective asteroid mining industry are being laid. In the end, the purpose of this paper is not to predict the future. Instead it aims to merely update a conscientious warning which called for our diligence more than 20 years ago. While the world has changed somewhat, the basic idea remains valid. Whether the danger comes from warring superpowers, terrorists or negligent corporations, we must be aware of the realistic risks in order to avoid being either stumped by unforeseen catastrophes or paralysed by unwarranted fear. Either extreme would be harmful for our future.●

#### Major collisions cause extinction

Baum ’19 - executive director of the Global Catastrophic Risk Institute, Ph.D in Geography

Seth Baum, “Risk-Risk Tradeoff Analysis of Nuclear Explosives for Asteroid Deflection,” SSRN Scholarly Paper (Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network, May 31, 2019), https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3397559.

The most severe asteroid collisions and nuclear wars can cause global environmental effects. The core mechanism is the transport of particulate matter into the stratosphere, where it can spread worldwide and remain aloft for years or decades. Large asteroid collisions create large quantities of dust and large fireballs; the fire heats the dust so that some portion of it rises into the stratosphere. The largest collisions, such as the 10km Chicxulub impactor, can also eject debris from the collision site into space; upon reentry into the atmosphere, the debris heats up enough to spark global fires (Toon, Zahnle, Morrison, Turco, & Covey, 1997). The fires are a major impact in their own right and can send additional smoke into the stratosphere. For nuclear explosions, there is also a fireball and smoke, in this case from the burning of cities or other military targets. While in the stratosphere, the particulate matter blocks sunlight and destroys ozone (Toon et al., 2007). The ozone loss increases the amount of ultraviolet radiation reaching the surface, causing skin cancer and other harms (Mills, Toon, Turco, Kinnison, & Garcia, 2008). The blocked sunlight causes abrupt cooling of Earth’s surface and in turn reduced precipitation due to a weakened hydrological cycle. The cool, dry, and dark conditions reduce plant growth. Recent studies use modern climate and crop models to examine the effects for a hypothetical IndiaPakistan nuclear war scenario with 100 weapons (50 per side) each of 15KT yield. The studies find agriculture declines in the range of approximately 2% to 50% depending on the crop and location.11 Another study compares the crop data to existing poverty and malnourishment and estimates that the crop declines could threaten starvation for two billion people (Helfand, 2013). However, the aforementioned studies do not account for new nuclear explosion fire simulations that find approximately five times less particulate matter reaching the stratosphere, and correspondingly weaker global environmental effects (Reisner et al., 2018). Note also that the 100 weapon scenario used in these studies is not the largest potential scenario. Larger nuclear wars and large asteroid collisions could cause greater harm. The largest asteroid collisions could even reduce sunlight below the minimum needed for vision (Toon et al., 1997). Asteroid risk analyses have proposed that the global environmental disruption from large collisions could cause one billion deaths (NRC, 2010) or the death of 25% of all humans (Chapman, 2004; Chapman & Morrison, 1994; Morrison, 1992), though these figures have not been rigorously justified (Baum, 2018a). The harms from asteroid collisions and nuclear wars can also include important secondary effects. The food shortages from severe global environmental disruption could lead to infectious disease outbreaks as public health conditions deteriorate (Helfand, 2013). Law and order could be lost in at least some locations as people struggle for survival (Maher & Baum, 2013). Today’s complex global political-economic system already shows fragility to shocks such as the 2007- 2008 financial crisis (Centeno, Nag, Patterson, Shaver, & Windawi, 2015); an asteroid collision or nuclear war could be an extremely large shock. The systemic consequences of a nuclear war would be further worsened by the likely loss of major world cities that serve as important hubs in the global economy. Even a single detonation in nuclear terrorism would have ripple effects across the global political-economic system (similar to, but likely larger than, the response prompted by the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001). It is possible for asteroid collisions to cause nuclear war. An asteroid explosion could be misinterpreted as a nuclear attack, prompting nuclear attack that is believed to be retaliation. For example, the 2013 Chelyabinsk event occurred near an important Russian military installation, prompting concerns about the event’s interpretation (Harris et al., 2015). The ultimate severity of an asteroid collision or violent nuclear conflict use would depend on how human society reacts. Would the reaction be disciplined and constructive: bury the dead, heal the sick, feed the hungry, and rebuild all that has fallen? Or would the reaction be disorderly and destructive: leave the rubble in place, fight for scarce resources, and descend into minimalist tribalism or worse? Prior studies have identified some key issues, including the viability of trade (Cantor, Henry, & Rayner, 1989) and the self-sufficiency of local communities (Maher & Baum, 2013). However, the issue has received little research attention and remains poorly understood. This leaves considerable uncertainty in the total human harm from an asteroid collision or nuclear weapons use. Previously published point estimates of the human consequences of asteroid collisions12 and nuclear wars (Helfand, 2013) do not account for this uncertainty and are likely to be inaccurate. Of particular importance are the consequences for future generations, which could vastly outnumber the present generation. If an asteroid collision or nuclear war would cause human extinction, then there would be no future generations. Alternatively, if survivors fail to recover a large population and advanced technological civilization, then future generations would be permanently diminished. The largest long-term factor is whether future generations would colonize space and benefit from its astronomically large amount of resources (Tonn, 1999). However, it is not presently known which asteroid collisions or nuclear wars (if any) would cause the permanent collapse of human civilization and thus the loss of the large future benefits (Baum et al., 2019). Given the enormous stakes, prudent risk management would aim for very low probabilities of permanent collapse (Tonn, 2009). It should be noted that the severity of violent nuclear conflict could depend on more than just the effects of nuclear explosions, because the overall conflict scenario could include non-nuclear violence. Indeed, it is possible for the nuclear explosions to constitute a relatively small portion of the total severity, as was the case in World War II. 4.4 Risk of Violent Non-Nuclear Conflict Finally, it is necessary to discuss the risk of violent non-nuclear conflict. Only a small portion of violent non-nuclear conflicts are applicable, specifically the portion affected by nuclear weapons. More precisely, this section discusses non-nuclear conflicts involving one or more countries that possess nuclear weapons at some point during the lifetime of a nuclear deflection program. Nuclear deterrence theory predicts that nuclear-armed adversaries will not initiate major wars against each other because both sides could be destroyed in a nuclear war. However, the theory does permit limited, small-scale violent conflicts between nuclear-armed countries. These conflicts likely would not involve nuclear weapons. Indeed, nuclear deterrence may even make small violent conflicts more likely, because the countries know that neither side wants to escalate the conflict into major war. This idea is known as the stability-instability paradox: nuclear deterrence brings stability with respect to major wars but instability with respect to minor conflicts. Empirical support for the stability-instability paradox has been found by some research (Rauchhaus, 2009),while other research has found no significant effect of the possession of nuclear weapons on the probability of conflicts of any scale (Bell & Miller, 2015; Gartzke & Jo, 2009). If countries fully disarm their nuclear arsenals, such that they would never have nuclear weapons again, then there would be no nuclear deterrence to prevent the onset of major wars. A simple risk analysis could assume that the risk of major wars would be comparable to the risk prior to the development of nuclear weapons. The two twentieth century World Wars combined for around 100 million deaths in 50 years,13 suggesting an annualized risk of two million deaths. However, two World Wars do not make for a robust dataset. Indeed, the robustness of these two data points is called into question by historical analysis finding that both world wars might not have occurred in the reasonably plausible event that the 1914 assassination of Archduke Ferdinand had failed (Lebow, 2014). Similarly, another historical analysis finds that the U.S. and Soviet Union would probably not have waged major war against each other even in the absence of nuclear deterrence (Mueller, 1988). Furthermore, these past events are not necessarily applicable to the future conditions of a post-nuclear-disarmament world. To the best of the present author’s knowledge, no studies have analyzed the risk of major wars in a post-nucleardisarmament world.
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**The United States federal government should substantially increase direct military-to-military communication and bilateral and multilateral hotlines with [the People’s Republic of China and the Russian Federation].**

**Hotlines and dialogue prevent escalation.**

**Trenin ‘19** [Dr. Dmitri Vitalyevich Trenin, PhD is the director of the Carnegie Moscow Center, a think tank and regional affiliate of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Strategic Stability in the Changing World. March 2019. https://carnegieendowment.org/files/3-15\_Trenin\_StrategicStability.pdf]

To maintain the minimum degree of strategic **stability**, it’s essential to prevent a direct military collision between the United States and Russia or the United States and China. With that goal in mind, there are already around-the-clock **comm**unication lines between the top military leaderships: ministers of defense, chiefs of general staff, and key U.S./NATO and Russian military personnel. Direct communication lines make it possible to **prevent** or **neutralize** incidents in the air, at sea, or on land that involve Russian and U.S./ NATO armed forces, thus **avoiding** any uncontrollable **escalation**. Communication channels between the leadership of the U.S. armed forces and the top brass of the Chinese **P**eople’s **L**iberation **A**rmy serve a similar purpose. A communication channel between the respective heads of U.S. and Russian intelligence, and between the U.S. and Chinese services, could play an important role as well. Direct contacts at the top political level are also critically important as a means of de-escalation in the most dangerous situations.

In addition to constantly functioning lines of communication, **U.S.**, **Russian**, and **Chinese** heads of national security, foreign affairs, and defense should engage in **regular dialogue** on **strategic stability issues**. Such dialogue allows parties to better **understand** each other’s **strategic logic**, the contents of **military doctrines**, and the rationale behind approaches to global and regional security programs. However, broader U.S.-Russian dialogue on strategic issues will likely remain blocked for a long time due to political reasons.

Functioning **arms control treaties** are **not** a sine qua non **requirement** for **strategic stability**. It is **highly unlikely** that the **U**nited **S**tates and **China** will **conclude arms control** agreements in the foreseeable future. Preserving **U.S.-Russian arms control** is already difficult enough, with **no prospect** for **improvement** visible on the horizon. But in this atmosphere of growing mistrust and mutual suspicion, discussions about strategic stability that aren’t aimed at negotiating specific agreements will likely be ineffective. The most that can be done diplomatically in the short term— or even the medium term—is to agree on conflict prevention, confidence-building, and transparency measures.